LearningSCAPES 2019

Creativity. Curiosity. Imagination.



Safe, Secure, and Supportive Schools: Creating learning environments that address the well-being of students and staff

LearningSCAPES 2019

- 8-week certificate course
- Certificate issued by A4LE
- Accredited by the International CPTED Association
- Eligible for AIA CEU's, including Health, Safety, and Welfare credits.
- Completely on-line, with no "real-time" commitments
- Fully accessible 24/7 with internet connection
- 6-10 hours per week commitment
- Delivered through San Diego State University, Interwork Foundation
- Delivery: April 20, 2020-June 12, 2020

Instructional Team



Gary Armbruster, AIA, ALEP PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT / PARTNER MA+ Architecture

Diego Barerra, AIA, NCARB, ALEP, LEED Green Assoc. Senior Design Architect | Senior Associate Stantec



Molly Smith, <u>REFP, AICP</u> Principal / Senior Planner thinkSMART Planning Inc.



Perceptions vs Facts



Facts about School Related Fatalities



The highest percentage of student deaths occur in transportation related incidents.

SCAPES



The percentage of deaths caused by suicide.

5%



The percentage of deaths caused by active shooters.

81%



The percentage of firearm homicides which occur in non-school rural settings.

Facts about School Related Fatalities



Greatest Risk to Children

Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)

Active abuse of children as well as neglect or failure to meet basic needs – mental and physical health is impacted and directly correlates to school dropout rates, suicide, and violence.

There is no more important endeavor than safeguarding the welfare of our children and youth. Creating safe and supportive schools is central to this purpose and must be a national priority. School safety is not achieved with a single program or piece of security equipment. Rather, effective school safety starts with prevention; provides for students' mental health; integrates physical and psychological safety; and engages schools, families, and communities as partners. We know what works, but schools need the resources—financial and human—to implement and sustain the practices that will truly make our children and schools safe from the inside out.

-National Association of School Psychologists



We Need a Variety of Tools

LearningSCAPES 2019





ANNOUNCING A NEW WEBSITE FROM ASSOCIATION FOR LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS



Visit www.SchoolSafety.a4le.org

SCHOOL SAFETY & SECURITY

PREPAREDNESS | PLANNING | RESPONSE | RECOVERY

School Facilities

School facilities play a key role in creating a self-school environment. Plaguardities and response positions and procedures are be added by a school facility that is but the response to beginch reads. The School Facilities section of this were portal focusies on helping schools, school desircts and school designers item about strategies to design and build safe inviting schools as well as tools to assess and address media in each school.

School Design

Mary practitioners today use CPTEC(1) strateges as the starting place to design safe schools that are inviting and inspring to their students. The four CPTED strateges are Natural Surveillance, Teintonial Reinforcement, Natural Access Control, and Martenance.

These four overlapping strategies work together to create a safer environment. National access control is a design strategy that is directed at decreasing crime opportunity. The primary goal of an access control strategy is to design strategy tratest and to create a percension of mis to the offneet. Natural Surveillance is a design strategy which many areas at

The School Security Dilemma: What Can Be Done?

The problem: A wealth of countermeasure choices; how to choose what's effective?

The assumption:

The cost to secure <u>all</u> school facilities against <u>all</u> possible threats exceeds any conceivable amount of capital funding

The Need: A method of prioritizing capital projects:

- > How to identify and prioritize threats?
- > How to choose effective countermeasures?
- > How to prioritize the choices within budget constraints?
- How to fund them?

School Security: Search For A Method

Sources:

- Whole Building Design Guideline (WBDG): Threat / Vulnerability Assessments and Risk Analysis, Nancy A. Renfroe, August 8, 2016
- General Services Administration, The Site Security Design Guide, June 2007
- FEMA Primer for Design Safe Schools Projects in Case of Terrorist Attacks (FEMA 428, 2003)

School Security: Search For A Method

Other Sources:

 Integrated Rapid Visual Screening of Schools: A How-To Guide to Mitigate Multihazard Effects Against School Facilities

School Security: Proposed Threat Assessment Methodology

I. Threat Assessment

- 1. Identify assets/mission to protect
- 2. Determine and rate the *plausible threat scenarios*

II. Vulnerability Assessment

3. Rate impact of loss and vulnerability for each threat scenario

III. Risk Assessment

4. Utilize threat, impact of loss, and vulnerability rating to determine *level of risk*

IV. Countermeasures

- 5. Identify **upgrades** to address identified risks
- V. Re-evaluate impact of loss and vulnerability based on upgrade recommendations:
 - 6. Repeat upgrade and re-evaluation process until risks are reduced or accepted
 - 7. Proceed with upgrades or develop budgets to implement as soon as funds are available
 - 8. Repeat security risk assessment; start process over

Method follows federal guidance on terrorist attacks (Interagency Security Committee (ISC) Design Criteria):

- This threat is not highly likely for schools in U.S. (but note Beslan, Russia September 2004)
- But methodology has validity for other types of threats more common to schools

School Security: Summary Of Factors

	Almost none	0.5
	Minimal	1
Threat Assessment (likelihood of occurrence)	Potential	2
	Credible	3
	Defined	4
	Minor	1
Impact of Loss	Noticeable	2
(at individual facility; not systemwide)	Severe	3
	Devastating	4
	Minor	1
Vulnerability	Typical	2
target assumed to be equal)	Severe	3
	Extreme	4

School Security: Risk Assessment Matrix

TYPE OF THREAT	THREAT ASS	ESSMENT		VU	LNERA	BILITY AS	SSESSME	ENT		RISK ASSESSMENT				
THREAT			(at	IN individu	MPACT al facili	OF LOSS ty; not sys	stemwide	e)	VULNERA- BILITY (existing fclt'y cntrmsrs)					
	a'	a"		b'			b"		С	a'xb'xc	a" x b" x c			
	TO OCCUPANTS (direct harm:		To (stuc ine	Occupan lent body dividuals	ts / or)	т	o Facility	,		TO OCCUPANTS (direct harm:				
	not indirect loss of resources etc.)	TO FACILITY	COMPR. SCHL. (ES, MS, HS)	SPEC. ED.	СТЕ	LIMITED (e.g. classr'm)	PARTIA L (e.g. wing)	TOTAL		not indirect loss of resources etc.)	TO FACILITY	COMBINED		
HUMAN														
Active shooter														
Bullying														
Vandalism														
Burglary/ I her														
Fire														
Vehicle attack (bomb)														
Tornado														
Hurricane														
Flood														
Earthquake														
Fire														
Landslide														
Snow														
Storm surge/tsunami														
High winds														
Heat wave														
Sea rise														

School Security: Risk Assessment Matrix

TYPE OF THREAT	TH ASSE	IREAT SSMENT	VULNER	ABILITY ASSE	SSMENT	RISK ASSESSMENT					
THREAT			IMPACT	OF LOSS	VULNER ABILITY	a' x b' x c	a" x b" x c	O + F			
	a'	a"	b'	b"	С	0	F				
	TO OCCUPANT S	TO FACILITY	TO OCCUPANT	TO FACILITY	то вотн	TO OCCUPANT	TO FACILITY	COMBINED			
HUMAN:											
Fire	2	2	1	2	2	4	8	12			

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX: Example

TYPE OF THREAT	THREAT ASS	ESSMENT		VUL	NERA	BILITY A	SSESSM		RISK	RISK ASSESSMENT			
THREAT			(at i	IN individua	IPACT al facili	OF LOSS ty; not sy	6 /stemwid	e)	VULNERA -BILITY (existing fclt'y cntrmsrs)				
	a'	a"		b'			b"		с	a'x b'x c	a" x b" x c		
	TO OCCUPANTS (direct harm)	то	To ((stud inc	Occupan lent body dividuals	its / or ;)	T	o Facility	,		TO OCCUPANTS (direct barm)	то		
	not indirect loss of resources etc.)	FACILITY	COMPR. SCHL. (ES, MS, HS)	SPEC. ED.	СТЕ	LIMITED (e.g. classr' m)	PARTIA L (e.g. wing)	TOTA L		not indirect loss of resources etc.)	FACILITY	COMBINED	
HUMAN:													
Active shooter	-	0.5	-	-	-	4	-	-	3	-	1.5	1.5	
Bullying	1	1				1			3		3	3	
Vandalism		3				3			2		18	18	
Burglary/Thef	t	2				2			2		8	8	
Fire		1				3			1		3	3	
Arson		1					3		2		6	6	
Vehicle attack (bomb)		0.5					4		4		8	8	
NATURAL:													
Tornado		1					3		4		12	12	
Hurricane	•	2						3	2		12	12	
Flood	1	1					3		4		12	12	
Earthquake		0.5						3	2		3	3	
Fire	2	1					3		2		6	6	
Landslide	·	0.5					4		4		8	8	
Show	:	4						2	1		0 10	ð 12	
		1						3	4		12	12	
Heat wove	>	0.5						3	4		12	1	
Sea rise	-	0.5	_	_	_	_	_	3	4	_	6	6	

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX: Example

TYPE OF THREAT	THREAT ASS	ESSMENT		VUL	NERA	BILITY A	SSESSM	ENT		RISK	RISK ASSESSMENT					
THREAT			(at	IN individua	IPACT al facilit	OF LOSS ty; not sy	s stemwid	e)	VULNERA -BILITY (existing fclt'y cntrmsrs)							
	a'	a"		b'			b"		с	a'x b'x c	a" x b" x c					
	TO OCCUPANTS (direct harm:	то	To (stuc inc	Occupan lent body dividuals	its / or ;)	Т	o Facility	1		TO OCCUPANTS (direct harm:	то	COMBINED				
	not indirect loss of resources etc.)	FACILITY	COMPR. SCHL. (ES, MS, HS)	SPEC. ED.	СТЕ	LIMITED (e.g. classr' m)	PARTIA L (e.g. wing)	TOTA L		not indirect loss of resources etc.)	FACILITY					
HUMAN:																
Active shoote	• 0.5	0.5	4	-	-	4	-	-	3	6	1.5	7.5				
Bullying	3	1	3			1			3	27	3	30				
Vandalism	1	3	1			3			2	2	18	20				
Burglary/Thef	t 3	2	3			2			2	18	8	26				
Fire	e 1	1	3			3			1	3	3	6				
Arsor	1	1	1				3		2	2	6	8				
Vehicle attack (bomb	0.5	0.5	4				4		4	8	8	16				
NATURAL:																
Tornado	1	1	3				3		4	12	12	24				
Hurricane	e 1	2	3					3	2	6	12	18				
Flood	1	1	3				3		4	12	12	24				
Earthquake	0.5	0.5	2					3	2	2	3	5				
Fire	2	1	3				3		2	12	6	18				
Landslide	0.5	0.5	3				4		4	6	8	14				
Snow	2	4	2					2	1	4	8	12				
Storm surge/tsunam	i 1	1	2					3	4	8	12	20				
High winds	s 1	1	3					3	4	12	12	24				
Heat wave	3	0.5	3					1	2	18	1	19				
Sea rise	0.5	0.5	4	-	-	_	-	3	4	2	6	8				

SCHOOL SECURITY: COUNTERMEASURES & CURATIVE MEASURES

TYPE OF THREAT				CURAT	IVE ME	ASURE	s				С						coui	COUNTERMEASURES												
THREAT		w	ELLBEII	NG			MENTA	L HEALT	н	DET	ectioi	N/ MC	NITOF	RING		PREVE	NTION	ı		MITIGATION				RESE	RESPONSE					
	Natural Light	Learning Spaces for Various Learning Styles	Proper Acoustics	Connection to Nature: Plants, Trees, Etc.	Views to Exterior	Smaller Classroom	Learning on Display/ Engage Inspire Students	Meditation Spaces	Areas for informal learning / socializing	Visibiity from within (CPTED)	Camera	Access system	Fire alarm	Early warning	Entry alarm	No blind spots (CPTED)	Limit access	Lock system	Standoff/no burn Perimeter	Evacuation procedure	Lighting	Pod Plan. Areas (wings) can be closed independently	Classroom locks	Area in classroom out of	Blinds, shades	Lock-down areas	Fire suppression	Area of refuge	Internal communication	External communication
HUMAN:																														
Active																														
Shooter		√ ,				√		√		V	√	V			V	√	V	V		V		V	V	V	V	V			V	<u> </u>
Bullying	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V					V	-1				-1	-1	-1							V
Burglary/The ft	v	v		v	v	V	v	•		v	v	v			v	v	v	v			v	V	v						v	V
Fire																														
(accidental)													٧	٧						۷							۷	٧	۷	V
Arson										V	٧		V	V		٧	٧	V		V							٧	V	٧	V
Vehicle attack (bomb)										٧	٧		v	v					v	v							v		v	v
NATURAL:																														
Tornado														٧						٧								٧	٧	٧
Hurricane														٧						٧								٧	٧	V
Flood														٧						٧								٧	٧	٧
Earthquake																				٧								٧	٧	٧
Fire													٧	٧					V	٧							1	٧	٧	٧
Landslide																				٧										٧
Snow														٧																٧
Storm surge/tsuna mi														٧						٧										٧
High winds														٧						٧								٧		٧
Heat wave														√						√								V		V

ANNOUNCING A NEW WEBSITE FROM ASSOCIATION FOR LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Visit www.SchoolSafety.a4le.org

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

CPTED is based on the theory that the proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the incidence and *fear of crime and an improvement in the quality of life.*

-Strategies are site specific

-Can be applied to new and existing projects

-Takes an inter-disciplinary approach to crime prevention

CPTED Theory

 The arrangement and design of buildings and open spaces can <u>encourage</u> or <u>discourage</u> undesirable behavior and criminal activity.

 It is possible to <u>reduce</u> opportunities for <u>crime</u> and <u>disorderly behavior</u> by changing the physical environment.

arningSCAPES 2019

Natural Surveillance

Natural surveillance is the physical ability to see what's going on in and around your school. Solid walls, tall shrubs, parked cars, outbuildings, sculptures, large signs and other obstacles can block natural surveillance.

Natural Surveillance

Open entry to allow staff to see who is approaching the facility.

Common approaches to increase visibility:

•Installing openings or windows in solid walls to increase visual exposure.

•Replacing solid walls with wrought iron fencing.

•Blocking access to hidden areas entirely.

•Removing any welcoming features, such as benches, that draw people into the hidden area.

Access Control

Natural access control limits the opportunity for crime by taking steps to clearly differentiate between public space and private space. By selectively placing entrances and exits, fencing, lighting and landscape to limit access or control flow, natural access control occurs.

Access Control

•Re-configuring as many excess entry doors as possible and only serve as emergency exits.

•Replace windows so they can't be used as entry points.

•The fewer the entry points, the less pressure the school is under to try to staff them.

Territoriality

Territorial reinforcement promotes social control through increased definition of space and improved proprietary concern.

Territoriality

Territoriality refers to measures that reinforce a message of ownership over the school.

ALL VISITORS MUST SIGN IN AT RECEPTION

SECURITY NOTICE

RULES FOR USE OF SCHOOL GROUNDS YOU ARE WELCOME TO USE THE SCHOOL GROUNDS IN KEEPING WITH THE FOLLOWING REGULATIONS:

- NO ONE IS PERMITTED ON SCHOOL GROUNDS AFTER DARK.
- 2. IMPROPER CONDUCT OR CREATING A PUBLIC DISTURBANCE OF ANY KIND IS PROHIBITED.
- 3. NO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES PERMITTED.
- 4. NO LOITERING OR VANDALISM.
- 5. NO VEHICLES PERMITTED OUTSIDE PARKING AREAS.
- 6. DIRECTIONS OF SECURITY GUARD MUST BE FOLLOWED.

Examples of Territoriality:

•Signs restricting access or directing visitors to the office.

•Posting campus closing times.

•Define the borders of the campus through open fencing to establish where public space ends and school begins.

Maintenance

Maintenance is an expression of ownership of property. Deterioration indicates less control by the intended users of a site and indicate a greater tolerance of disorder.

Maintenance

Maintenance further reinforces territoriality. Any unkempt part of the campus sends a message that no one is particularly concerned about or possessive of that part of the school.

Examples of Maintenance:

•Fix broken windows.

•Mow the lawns and trim landscaping.

•Get rid of graffiti.

•Repair deteriorated parts of the building.

•Keep hallways and stairwells free of clutter.

CPTED Conclusion

CPTED principles should be used in conjunction with all the other secu measures a school employs to create an overall "SECURITY PROGRA for the school and district.

Counter and Curative Measures

Curative

Counter

- Well Being
- Mental Health
- Detection/Monitoring
- Prevention
- Mitigation
- Response

Well Being

- Nutrition
- Safety
- Sleep
- Health
- Nat Light
- Outdoors
- Activity

Curative Measures

Mental Health

- Counseling
- Prevention
- Intervention
- Mentoring
- Special Ed

earningSCAPES 2019

Counter Measures

 Detection/ Monitoring

- Prevention
- Mitigation
- Response

• School safety is the responsibility of everyone in the community

LearningSCAPES 2019

 Safety design features need to be supported with policies, training and routine monitoring, inspections and maintenance of those policies and procedures

- The Presidential Policy Directive (PPD-8) defines preparedness around five
 - mission areas:
 - Prevention
 - Protection
 - Mitigation
 - Response
 - Recovery

LearningSCAPES 2019

• **Prevention**: The capabilities necessary to avoid, deter, or stop an imminent crime or threatened or actual mass casualty incident. Prevention is the action schools take to prevent a threatened or actual incident from occurring.

LearningSCAPES 2019

 Protection: The capabilities to secure schools against violence and manmade or natural disasters. Protection focuses on ongoing actions that protect schools and property from a threat or hazard.

• **Mitigation**: The capabilities necessary to eliminate or reduce the loss of life and property damage by lessening the impact of an emergency.

LearningSCAPES 2019

• **Response**: The capabilities necessary to stabilize an emergency once it is already happened.

Recovery: The capabilities necessary to assist schools affected by an emergency.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES PLANNING PROCESS

(The following information was developed from guidelines provided by the Readiness and Emergency Management for Schools Center (REMS)

STEP 1 Create a Collaborative Planning Team	STEP 2 Understanding the Situation	STEP 3 Determine Goals and Objectives	STEP 4 Plan Development	STEP 5 Plan Preparation, Review and Approval	STEP 6 Plan Implementation & Maintenance
Identify Planning Team	Identify Threats and Hazards	Develop Goals	Depict the Scenario	Format the Plan	Train the Stakeholders
Form a Common Framework	Assess Risks	Develop Objectives	Determine Time Available to Respond	Write the Plan	Exercise the Plan
Define and Assign Roles & Responsibilitie	Prioritize Threats and Hazards		ldentify Decision Points	Review the Plan	Review, Revise and Maintain the Plan
s Determine a Schedule of Meetings	Point 2		Develop Course Actions	Approve and Share the Plan	

Our Goal: To Help You Create Safe and Inspiring Learning Environments!

LearningSCAPES 2019

Creativity. Curiosity. Imagination.

